



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,088	11/23/1999	EDWARD A. RICHLEY	D/98588	4649

25453 7590 09/04/2002

PATENT DOCUMENTATION CENTER
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVE., SOUTH, XEROX SQUARE, 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN CHAU N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/448,088

Applicant(s)

RICHLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Prelim. Amdt/Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed 26 June 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowers et al (US 5,963,134) in view of Huang et al (US 6,060,992).

Re claims 1 and 4, Bowers et al discloses a system 10 for identification and tracking of tags 54 distributed in a room. The system comprising a base station 42 for scanning beam; a tag 54 reactive to incident beams; and a tag tracking system 52 receiving input from the base station

Art Unit: 2876

42; the tag tracking system 52 storing state records of position and information content of the tag 54; wherein the tag 54 is passive (figs. 1-4; col. 7, line 8 through col. 10, line 64).

Bowers et al fails to teach or fairly suggest that the system is using laser technology, wherein the base station is a laser base station.

Huang et al teaches the above limitation with a laser base tracking system comprising a reader 40 having laser scanner for reading tag 42 (fig. 4; col. 4, line 38 through col. 5, line 17).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Huang et al into the teachings of Bowers et al in order to provide Bowers et al with the latest technology system, wherein the laser beam would provide the system with a more accurate result, and thus providing a more user-friendly system. Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Bowers et al, well within the ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowers et al as modified by Huang et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Harvey et al (US 5,463,463). The teachings of Bowers et al as modified by Huang et al have been discussed above.

Re claims 2 & 3, Bowers et al/Huang have been discussed above but fails to expressly disclose or fairly suggest teaches that the tag tracking system determines angular position of the tag with respect to the laser base station and comprising at least two laser base stations wherein the tag tracking system determines absolute position of the tag.

Art Unit: 2876

Harvey et al teaches the above limitation with two lasers [14 & 16] for tracking the target 12 and determine the absolute angular position $[x, y, z, \theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3]$ of the target 12 (figs. 1-5; col. 2, line 26 through col. 4, line 28).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Harvey et al into the teachings of Bowers et al/Huang in order to provide Bowers et al/Huang with a more accurate system, wherein the exact location/position of an object can be determined. Furthermore, such modification would have Bowers et al/Huang with a more user-friendly system, in which it would provide the user an organized inventory storage record and would save a lot of time for the user in finding an object. Accordingly, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Bowers et al/Huang, well within ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

6. Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowers et al as modified by Huang as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Moran et al (US 6,005,482). The teachings of Bowers et al as modified by Huang have been discussed above.

Re claims 5-8, Bowers et al/Huang have been discussed above but fails to expressly disclose or fairly suggest that the tag is active, having an internal power supply to power a data broadcast element; an optical data output element; a radio data output element; an acoustic data output element.

Moran et al teaches the above limitation radio tags 110, infrared tags 116, acoustic tags 122 (figs. 2 & 3; col. 8, line 16 through col. 9, line 9).

It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Moran et al into the teachings of Bowers et

Art Unit: 2876

al/Huang in order to provide Bowers et al/Huang with a more user-friendly system, wherein the user has the flexibility to retrieve the output data in various of forms (i.e., optical form, radio form, or acoustic form, etc.). Furthermore, such modification would have been an obvious extension as taught by Bowers et al/Huang, well within ordinary skill in the art, and therefore an obvious expedient.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

A new ground of rejection has made based on newly discovered references to further meet the limitation of claims 1-4.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The patents to Tooley (US 5,252,814); Houser et al (US 5,886,775); Burks et al (US 5,748,321); Harvey et al (US 5,532,824); Brown (US 5,530,549); Gendreu (US 4,148,026); and McMurtry et al are cited as of interest and illustrate a similar structure to a laser locating and tracking system for externally activated tags.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen-Chau N. Le whose telephone number is 703-306-5588.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-T and TR-F 8:30-7:00.


Art Unit: 2876

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL G LEE can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.


Uyen Chau N. Le

August 28, 2002


MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800